



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/533,781	03/24/2000	Sriram Ramani	HP10992784	2479

22879 7590 05/07/2004

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

BASEHOAR, ADAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

124

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/533,781	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RAMANI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Adam L Basehoar	<b>Art Unit</b> 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 2178

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: the Amendment filed on 02/10/04 to the original application filed on 03/24/00.

2. Claims 1-20 remain rejected in this case. Claims 1, 11, and 18 are independent claims.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-15, 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al (US: 6,493,731 12/10/02).

-In regard to independent claims 1, 11, and 18, Jones et al teach a first set of data fields (Fig. 4: 407) of the document task (parent task) with a document resource (sub-identifier) field (Fig. 4: 403 & 408), wherein metadata fills the fields of the first set of data fields and wherein the sub-identifier field identifies secondary documents linking metadata in the secondary documents to the source document task. Jones et al do not specifically teach wherein changes to the secondary documents update the data fields in the parent document task and presenting it to the user. Jones et al do teach wherein the secondary document metadata is embedded in the parent document task (column 6, lines 22-30)(Fig. 4: 409). Thus it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2178

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, that changes in metadata of the secondary documents would be displayed in the parent document transaction viewable by the user.

-In regard to dependent claim 2, Jones et al teach wherein the document task (parent task) has a first set of data fields and a first set of metadata (Fig. 4: 407).

-In regard to dependent claims 3, 4, 12, and 13, Jones et al teach wherein the sub-identifier field links the parent document task to secondary document task (Fig. 4) which comprises a second set of data fields and a second set of metadata (Fig. 4: 411) that represent the attributes of the secondary document, where changes in the secondary document would be reflected in the parent document task through the link. Jones et al further teach wherein the second set of metadata comprises relational data that corresponds to the first set of data fields (Fig. 4: 407 corresponds to 411) and wherein a change to the corresponding metadata field is accomplished by filling the corresponding metadata field with metadata.

-In regard to dependent claim 5, Jones et al wherein the metadata of the parent document task is stored on a computer (repository) (Fig. 11) and wherein the document management system accessed the data by a processor (core).

-In regard to dependent claim 6, Jones et al teach wherein the document management system processor (core) can automatically create typed links between the documents (parent

Art Unit: 2178

document task and secondary documents)(column 8, lines 46-50) and populates the contents data field with the location and local name of the generated secondary document (column 6, lines 30-40).

-In regard to dependent claims 8 and 19, Jones et al teach when the task document is set to “completed,” then the operators performing other tasks are then granted permission to view the task document and metadata (column 8, lines 14-17), wherein operator (client) requests to access and view the task document was permitted only when the task document was set to “completed.” Jones et al do not teach having a field that includes permissions about who may access the document. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have had another data field listing said other operators (clients) who would be given permission of the task document when it was “completed”, because it would inform said operators when and who could view the task documents and prevent unnecessary requests from operators whom could not get permission.

-In regard to dependent claim 9, Jones et al teach a second sub-identifier that includes metadata that represents the attributes of the second secondary document (Fig. 4: 408: “Notes from Meeting”), wherein data in the second secondary document is linked to the parent document task.

Art Unit: 2178

-In regard to dependent claim 14, Jones et al teach populating the sub-identifier fields with metadata that identifies the secondary documents (Fig. 4: 411), and populating the identifier fields with metadata that identifies the parent document task (Fig. 4: 407).

-In regard to dependent claim 15, Jones et al teach wherein the parent and secondary documents are stored in computer memory (repository) and whereby the first and second set of metadata maybe accessed (Fig. 3).

5. Claims 7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al (US: 6,493,731 12/10/02) in view of W3C's "XML 1.0", 02/10/98

<http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-xml-19980210#sec-intro>.

-In regard to dependent claims 7 and 20, Jones et al teach wherein documents can be web pages (column 6, 37-39) or documents located on other servers (Fig. 11). Jones et al do not teach wherein the documents are capable of being displayed using a web browser. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, because it was well known in the art for web browsers to be used to display web pages and documents (pages) located on other servers. Jones et al also do not teach wherein the documents are written in extensible markup language. W3C teaches that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have written the documents in XML, because XML documents were known to be easy to write and process for web based applications (Intro).

Art Unit: 2178

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al (US: 6,493,731 12/10/02) in further view Tabb et al (US: 6,493,731 02/11/97).

-In regard to dependent claim 10, Jones et al do not teach wherein the parent document task is a purchase order and one of the secondary documents is a sales order. Tabb et al teach a similar document management system wherein the parent document task is a purchase order and a linking secondary document is the sales order (Fig. 7B). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, for Jones et al to have displayed linked purchase and sales orders, because Tabb et al teach by doing so users can be kept up to date on the status of their purchase orders.

7. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al (US: 6,493,731 12/10/02) in view of "XML Programming With C++", Fabio Arciniegas A., November 17, 1999, <http://www.xml.com/pub/a/1999/11/cplusplus/>.

-In regard to dependent claims 16 and 17, Jones et al and W3C do not teach wherein the step of creating involves XML supported code. Arciniegas teaches that C++ was a popular programming language for many XML related efforts (Section: Intro). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, for Jones et al to have submitted C++ containing the first set of data fields and metadata (Fig. 4), because Arciniegas teaches that C++ is well suited for XML processing in terms of availability, size and complexity of code, conformance, portability, and performance (Section: Conclusion).

*Response to Arguments*

8. Applicant's arguments filed 02/10/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

-In regard to independent claims 1, 11, and 18, Applicant's main argument is that Jones does not disclose or suggest the amended feature that the data generated by the secondary transaction is used to update the active document. The examiner disagrees with the Applicant's argument that the obviousness rejection is unfounded. The examiner notes that Jones teaches that while an active document task is developed secondary transaction document data is linked to the active document, wherein the resource secondary transaction acts as metadata towards the active document task (column 3, lines 1-12). This implies that any data generated (i.e. modified) at the secondary transaction document resource level would update the active document via their linked relationship. In addition, as noted above in the rejection to the claims, the Jones reference implies that it would have been obvious because of metadata stored in fields on the active document incorporated embedded secondary document metadata. Thus any changes generated by the secondary document resources would obviously effect/update the parent active document task. For example, a parent task document could rely upon a resource object containing stored personal contact information related to the task (column 5, lines 33-37). If said stored personal information was updated to reflect changes in a person's contact information, said newly generated information would be available at the parent task via the linked data (column 6, lines 47-51).



Art Unit: 2178

-In regard to the argument that Jones does not relate to transactions to business processes conducted over the internet or for systems for improving the sharing and accessing of information regarding transactions, the examiner notes that these features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The examiner also wishes to point out that the embodiment of Jones et al includes tracking and viewing documents used for supporting business processes over a network to provided information to the right person at the right time (column 1, 15-38).

Art Unit: 2178

***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US: 6,463,420	10-2002	Guidice et al.
---------------	---------	----------------

US: 6,220,509	04-2001	Byford
---------------	---------	--------

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L Basehoar whose telephone number is (703) 305-7212. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:30am - 4:00pm.

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB

  
**JOSEPH FEILD**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**